



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,843	02/04/2004	Conor Cahill	AOL0095	6050
22862 7590 12/11/2009 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
EXAMINER				
LE, CANH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2439				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/11/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eptomatters@glenn-law.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/772,843

Applicant(s)

CAHILL ET AL.

Examiner

CANH LE

Art Unit

2439

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11, 13-25 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11, 13-25, and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/11/2009 has been entered.

This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on 09/11/2009.

Claims 1-8, 12, and 26 have been cancelled.

Claims 9, 10-11, 14, and 25 have been amended.

Claim 27 has been added.

Claims 9-11, 13-25, and 27 have been examined and are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 6-7, filed 09/11/2009, with respect to the objection of the drawing and the specification have been fully considered. The objection of the drawing and the specification has been withdrawn due to the Applicant acknowledgment that prior art label of figures 1 and 2 were incorrect used.

Applicant's arguments, see page 7, filed 09/11/2009, with respect to the objection of claims 11 and 25 have been fully considered. The objection of claims 11 and 25 has been withdrawn due to amendment.

Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-8, filed 09/11/2009, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st rejection of claims 9-11, 13-15, and 26 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st rejection of claims 9-11, 13-15, and 26 has been withdrawn due to amendment.

Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 09/11/2009, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd rejection of claims 9-11, 13-25, and 26 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd rejection of claims 9-11, 13-25, and 26 has been withdrawn due to amendment.

Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 09/11/2009, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 26 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 26 due to cancellation of claim 26.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-11, 13-25, and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Objections

Claims 9, 15, and 27 are objected to because of the following informalities:

(Claim 9, line 9): “said owner” should be replaced “said computer-implemented owner” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

(Claim 9, line 14): “point of access” should be replaced “**shared** point of access” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

(Claim 9, line 16): “point of access” should be replaced “**shared** point of access” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

(Claim 15, line 2): “**said other** service provider affiliation” should be replaced “**other** service provider affiliation” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

(Claim 27, line 3): the symbol “/” in the phrase “provider / affiliation”. It is unclear the meaning of the symbol “/”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the virtue" in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-11, 13-25, and 27 are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yared et al.** (US 2003/0149781 A1) in view of **Pardo-Blazquez et al.** (US 2007/0226774 A1).

As per claim 9:

Yared teaches a computer-implemented method for establishing an affiliation within a single sign-on system, comprising the steps of:

(a) establishing one or more affiliations of computer-implemented service providers, each affiliation acting as a single entity on a network for purposes of any of authentication, federation, and authorization [Yared: **fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”**];

(b) establishing a computer-implemented owner of each said affiliation that maintains a list that shows which service providers are members of said affiliation, as well as any control structure or meta-data associated with said affiliation [Yared: **fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”**; user directory 920 includes Service Provider A & Service Provider B] said

owner comprising a shared point of access for said service providers [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; **Identifier A is a shared point of access of Service Provider A and Service Provider B] and**

(c) providing a unique identifier for each said affiliation within said single sign-on system in which said affiliation is defined [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; *"Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked"*; *"This configuration allows a user to authentication with multiple service providers 910, 915 using identity provider A 905;"* par. [0009]; *A single sign-on architecture is provided to facilitate user interactions with service providers; Identity Provider A is a unique identifier for affiliation of Service Provider A and Service Provider B;* par. [0045]; lines 6-8],

Yared discloses an explicit trust chain is created when a user invokes account linking between a service provider and an identity provider [Yared: par. [0010], **an explicit trust;** par. [0012], [0109], [0113], **figs. 9, 11**] but does not explicitly disclose wherein trust is established with a user at said shared point of access for purposes of authentication and authorization, even if said point of access does not share common authentication requirements, by the virtue of said affiliation between said service providers at said point of access.

However, Pardo-Blazquez teaches liberty discovery service enhancements, wherein trust is established with a user at said shared point of access for purposes of authentication and authorization, even if said point of access does not share common authentication requirements, by the virtue of said affiliation between said service providers at said point of access [Pardo-Blazquez: fig.1; par. [0014]; **user (150-2) interacting with user terminal (150-1), Identity**

Provider IDP (90), Plurality of Service Providers SPs (110, 120, 130, 140), Discovery Service Server (DS server 100); par. [0016]; “User (150) can communicate (11) with more than one SP (110,120,130) and *gain access to different services* that are subject to *user authentication by using SSO feature ...* For example, the user (150) established *a first communication with SP 100 and gets authenticated in this SP ... The IDP provides an authentication assertion to SP 120, which grants access to the corresponding service in this SP without the user having to provide his credential again*”; IDP is known as a shared point of access for purpose of authentication and authentication].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Yared by including the teaching of Pardo-Blazquez, wherein trust is established with a user at said shared point of access for purposes of authentication and authorization, even if said point of access does not share common authentication requirements, by the virtue of said affiliation between said service providers at said point of access to provide a registration process for registering a non-registered identity service of a user from a Discovery Service server, said user is alleviated of having an accurate knowledge about what identity services can he benefit from, and also alleviated of having to find by himself a Service Provider which can host said identity services [Pardo-Blazquez: par. [0028].

As per claim 10:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above. Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the steps of:

(a) each one of multiple principals acquiring a federated identity [Yared: par. [0047]; **Embodiments of the present invention include single sign-on, *federated identity* and web service features; par. [0110-0111]; fig. 5 is an interaction flowchart illustrating *an identity federation* process; par. [0120-0121]; fig. 14, [0122]; "a user is authenticated by an identity provider and redirected to service provider"]];**

(b) providing an identity provider to authenticate and vouch for said principals [Yared: par. [0009], lines 6-8; *an identity provider* is an entity that creates, manages, and stores identity information for a plurality of users; par. [0047]; a federated identity; par. [0110-0111]; fig. 5 is an interaction flowchart illustrating an identity federation process; par. [0120-0121]; fig. 14, [0122]; "a user is authenticated by an identity provider and redirected to service provider"]].

As per claim 11:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above. Yared further teaches the method of Claim 10, further comprising the steps of:

(a) a principal logging into said identity provider [Yared: fig. 2; **login to Identity Provider 225; par. [0062]; par. [0063]; "the user can then login to identity provider 225 using, for example a password-based identity credential"]];**

(b) said principal visiting a first service provider and federating to said affiliation [Yared: par. [0048-0049]; **an identity provider authenticate a user's identity and passes a credential to a service provider; par. [0047]; *by federating an account with an identity provider*, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using an existing**

service provider-specific username ; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”]; and

(c) said principal then visiting any other service provider within said affiliation without having to separately federate to said other service provider [Yared: par. [0047]; *by federating an account with an identity provider*, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using an existing service provider-specific username ... Further, the identity provider can be federated with other service providers that provide various application; ; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”].

As per claim 13:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Pardo-Blazquez further teaches providing a discovery service for enabling a web service consumer to discover service information regarding a user's personal web services [Pardo-Blazquez: fig. 1; par. [0008-0009]; Discovery Service (DS) allows a first SP to access the second SP which hold the wanted resource ... the service that allows a Web Service Consumer (WSC) to access to Web Service Provider (WSP) to act upon some resource; par. [0014-0017]].

As per claim 14:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Pardo-Blazquez further teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising the step of: providing a web service consumer associated with a service provider for requesting a service descriptor and assertion for service from said discovery service and for presenting an assertion from an other service provider with affiliate information [**Pardo-Blazquez: fig. 1; par. [0008-0009]; Discovery Service (DS) allows a first SP to access the second SP which hold the wanted resource ... the service that allows a Web Service Consumer (WSC) to access to Web Service Provider (WSP) to act upon some resource; par. [0014-0017]; authentication assertion**].

As per claim 15:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Pardo-Blazquez further teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising the step of: said discovery service checking said other service provider affiliation and generating a service assertion based upon said other service provider affiliation [**Pardo-Blazquez: fig. 1; par. [0008-0009]; par. [0014-0017], [0026], [0030]**].

As per claim 16:

Pardo-Blazquez further teaches the method of claim 15, further comprising the step of: said web service consumer invoking a service with said service assertion via a web service provider [**Pardo-Blazquez: fig. 1; par. [0009], the service that allows a Web Service**

Consumer (WSC) to access to Web Service Provider (WSP) to act upon some resource; par. [0014-0017], [0019-0021]].

As per claim 17:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein said affiliation has an identifier that is unique within a single sign-on system in which said affiliation is defined [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “*Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked*”; par. [0009]; single *sign-on architecture* is provided to facilitate user interactions with service providers].

As per claim 18:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein service providers within a single sign-on system may be members of multiple affiliations, but are programmed to act only with a single affiliation for any given transaction [Yared: par. [0047]; “*By federation an account with an identity provider, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using existing service provider-specific username and also have benefits if using the identity providers. Further, the identity provider can be federated with other services that provide various applications. As described in detail below, account federation enables system entities to collaborate to provide user a service or perform a service on behalf of the user*”].

As per claim 19:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein a user federating with an affiliation automatically federates with all members of said affiliation [Yared: par. [0047]; “ By federation an account with an identity provider, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using existing service provider-specific username and also have benefits if using the identity providers. Further, the identity provider can be federated with other services that provide various applications. As described in detail below, account federation enables system entities to collaborate to provide user a service or perform a service on behalf of the user”; See also par. [0010]; “Accounts are linked using, for example, dynamically generated, which are shared by service provider and identity provider being linked”; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Each handle is a dynamically generated, strong random identifier serving as a name for the principal in the namespace between the identity provider and the service provider”].

As per claim 20:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein a user authorizing access to a service by said federation authorizes access to any member of said affiliation [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0047]; par. [0117]].

As per claim 21:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the step of:

(a) providing a unique identifier for every affiliation, and responsive to a service provider having a service provider identity requesting an identity of a user through different affiliations, said service provider receiving different, unique identifiers for each affiliation [Yared: figs. 9-10, pars. [0117-0118]].

As per claim 22:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the step of:

providing a common identifier to all members of said affiliation when they are acting as a part of said affiliation [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; "*Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked*"; "*This configuration allows a user to authentication with multiple service providers 910, 915 using identity provider A 905*";

As per claim 23:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the step of:

providing an affiliation name identifier for allowing sites to handle an automatic

federation that take place with all members of said affiliation [Yared: par. [0047]; “ By federation an account with an identity provider, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using existing service provider-specific username and also have benefits if using the identity providers. Further, the identity provider can be federated with other services that provide various applications. As described in detail below, account federation enables system entities to collaborate to provide user a service or perform a service on behalf of the user”; See also par. [0010]; “Accounts are linked using, for example, dynamically generated, which are shared by service provider and identity provider being linked”; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Each handle is a dynamically generated, strong random identifier serving as a name for the principal in the namespace between the identity provider and the service provider”].

As per claim 24:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared and Pardo-Blazquez further teach the method of claim 9, wherein said network comprises:

a web services-based service infrastructure in which users manage sharing of their personal information across identity providers and service providers [Yared: fig. 9, 11; Par. [0153-156]; Web services Architecture; par. [0159]; various identity providers and services provider can extend schemas in many way to store information; par. [0163]; Pardo-Blazquez: fig. 1; par. [0014-0017]].

As per claim 25:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared further teaches the method of claim 24, wherein said web services implement a lightweight protocol for exchange of information in a decentralized, distributed environment, and said lightweight protocol comprises an envelope that defines a framework for describing what is in a message and how to process it, a set of encoding rules for expressing instances of application-defined data types, and a convention for representing remote procedure calls and responses [Yared : par. [0011]; par. [0064]; **“In an embodiment, back channel communications use the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP). SOAP enables a variety of computing devices to interoperate over HTTP”**; See par. [0153-0161]; Web Services Architecture].

As per claim 27:

The combination of Yared and Pardo-Blazquez teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared and Pardo-Blazquez further teach the method of Claim 9, said unique identifier comprising: a principal identifier comprising any of the following semantics:

- (a) a name identifier that is unique for any service provider/affiliation combination

[Yared: fig. 9; **Joe123@IP_A.com** is known as a name identifier; Pardo-Blazquez: par. [0010]; **an identifier which identifies uniquely a service instance of the service type which relates to said user**];

Conclusion

The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line number(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application. Failure to show support can result in a non-compliant response.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised that if Applicant traverses an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, a reasoned statement must be included explaining why the Applicant believes the Office has erred substantively as to the factual findings or the conclusion of obviousness See 37 CFR 1.111(b).

Additionally Applicant is further advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Canh Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Orgad Edan can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Canh Lc/

Examiner, Art Unit 2439

December 2, 2009

/Edan Orgad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439